



## BEDOK VIEW SECONDARY SCHOOL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION 2019

CANDIDATE  
NAME

REGISTER  
NUMBER

CLASS

---

**HUMANITIES**

**2272/01, 2273/01**

**Secondary Four Express / Five Normal (Academic)**

**27 August 2019**

Paper 1 Social Studies

**1 hour 45 minutes**

---

# Answer Scheme

**1(a)** Study Source A.

Do you think the cartoonist is a supporter or an opponent of the burkini ban? Explain your answer. [6]

Level	Descriptor	Mks
<b>L1</b>	<b>General statement on agreement/disagreement without valid source use</b>  The cartoonist is a supporter/opponent of the burkini ban.	<b>1</b>
<b>L2</b>	<b>Support based on description of source</b>  The cartoonist in Source A supports the ban because the policeman says that removing the burkini would help the woman 'against oppression.'	<b>2</b>
<b>L3</b>	<b>Support based on inference</b>  The cartoonist in Source A supports the ban because the policemen are seen to be caring. The intent of the ban is supposed to protect the women against oppression.	<b>3</b>
<b>L4</b>	<b>Makes valid inference/choice based on source, unsupported</b>  The cartoonist is an opponent of the ban. He is being sarcastic because it is the policemen who are being the oppressors, and not the one helping them against oppression.	<b>4</b>
<b>L5</b>	<b>Makes valid inference/choice based on source, supported</b>  The cartoonist is an opponent of the ban. He is being sarcastic because it is the policemen who are being the oppressors, and not the one helping them against oppression. This can be seen in the cartoon which illustrates two French police standing over a Muslim woman with one of them saying to her "Take your burkini off! We are helping you against oppression".	<b>5</b>
<b>L6</b>	<b>Choice based on overall evaluation of writer's attitude</b>  The cartoonist is an opponent of the ban. He is being sarcastic because it is the policemen who are being the oppressors, and not the one helping them against oppression. This can be seen in the cartoon which illustrates two French police standing over a Muslim woman with one of them saying to her "Take your burkini off! We are helping you against oppression". He is being ironic/sarcastic because the body language of the two men as well as their stern facial expression conveys an uncaring and condescending attitude, as they tower over her. It is a humiliating act disguised as something borne out of concern.	<b>6</b>

**(b) Study Source B.**

Why do you think this statement was made at this time? Explain your answer.

[6]

Level	Descriptor	Mks
L1	<b>Repeats information from source</b> She wanted to say that the burkini was invented to give women freedom.	1
L2	<b>Because of what she wanted to say</b>  <i>2 marks for one explained reason, additional mark for another reason</i>  She wants to say that the burkini is not exclusive for use by Muslims only. It is not meant to be an object to signify Islam.  She wanted to explain the real reason behind the creation of the burkini so that she can clarify misconceptions the garment has generated.	2-3
L3	<b>L2 + consideration of wider context</b>  <i>4 marks for one explained reason, supported. Additional mark for another reason, supported.</i>  She made this statement in Source B in response to the burkini ban in France which has caused a lot of misunderstanding and unhappiness / public anger among the Muslim community. After all the burkini was created by her and lies at the heart of the controversy in France. In Source B she says, 'you have misunderstood. .. a product that symbolised happiness and joyfulness and fitness, and turned it into a product of hatred.' Therefore she wants to express her disapproval.  She made this statement in Source B in response to the burkini ban in France which has caused a lot of misunderstanding and unhappiness / public anger among the Muslim community. After all the burkini was created by her and lies at the heart of the controversy in France. She wanted to address the misconception how the burkini has been associated as an Islamic dress when in reality it is more inclusive, because Jews, Christians, Hindus and people of all religions can wear it. As such, she wants to clarify that the burkini is not exclusive for use by Muslims only. It is not meant to be an object to signify Islam. In Source B she says that, 'It's just a garment to suit a modest person, or someone who has skin cancer, or a new mother who doesn't want to wear a bikini, it's not symbolising Islam.'  She is saddened by the negative reaction and controversy surrounding the burkini. She made this statement in Source B in response to the burkini ban in France which has caused a lot of misunderstanding and unhappiness / public anger among the Muslim community. After all, the burkini was created by her and lies at the heart of the controversy in France. She is upset that it has been misrepresented as a symbol of oppression by the French government. She wanted to explain the real reason behind the creation of the burkini so that she can clarify	4-5

	misconceptions the garment has generated. She `invented the burkini ... to give women freedom, not take it away.'	
<b>L4</b>	<p><b>L3 + Because of the impact she wanted this have to have</b></p> <p>In so doing, she hopes people would be more receptive of the burkini. Once people hear from the inventor herself what her real intentions in designing the burkini are, they would have a better understanding of the issue and be more open minded about it and hopefully form better informed opinions about the matter. [5] She wants the French government to see the burkini in another light and not demonise it as a symbol of oppression. [6]</p>	<b>6</b>

(c) Study Sources C and D

Would the author in Source D agree with the author in Source C? Explain your answer. [7]

	Descriptor	Marks
L1	<p><b>Similarity/ Difference of provenance or topic</b></p> <p>E.g. They would agree because both are talking about the burkin ban.  <b>OR</b>  E.g. They are similar because both are about terrorism  <b>OR</b>  E.g. They are different as one is a newspaper article, the other is a survey finding.</p>	1
L2	<p><b>Agree based on: Invalid Matching</b></p> <p>E.g. They would agree because the PM in Source C says the burkini is a symbol of oppression. In Source D, the author says that the burkini ban is justified based on secularism.</p>	2
L3	<p><b>Agree OR disagree based on valid matching of source content, supported</b></p> <p><i>Award 3 marks for 1 similarity/ difference, supported and 4 marks for two or more similarities/ differences.</i></p> <p><u>Agree based on similarity of ideas/views</u></p> <p>E.g. The author in Source D would agree with the writer in Source C because both hold the view that there is a legitimate reason for the burkini ban. In Source C, it says that the burkini is 'a symbol of the oppression of women'. Source D agrees with this by saying that 'public expression of religious beliefs are viewed in France with distaste and suspicion'. The burkini being seen as a symbol of oppression reflects how it is seen with distaste and suspicion.</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>Disagree based on Difference</p> <p>E.g. The author in Source D would disagree with the author in Source C in terms of their attitude towards the Muslims in France. In Source C the author frames it in terms of the refusal of the Muslims to assimilate with the secular beliefs of the country. This reflects his impatience and intolerance towards Muslims who fail to assimilate into French society. The author in Source D however disagrees that it is</p>	3-4

	a reflection of the anti-Muslim attitude by saying that 'It is tempting to blame this tendency to legislate against religion on just opportunist politicians keen to jump on any anti-Muslim bandwagon.' He is implying that anti-Islamic sentiments have nothing to do with the ban. Rather, it is rooted in the strong belief in secularism.	
<b>L4</b>	<b>Agree AND disagree based on valid matching of source content,</b> E.g. Both L3 examples	<b>5</b>
<b>L5</b>	<b>L4 + disagree, based on purpose, supported.</b>  <i>6 marks for one explained purpose</i> <i>Additional mark for additional purpose, explained</i>  The author in Source D, being a columnist in a newspaper, would have a different purpose in trying to set the context of the issue by linking to the issue to the French government approach to secularism. His main objective is perhaps to enlighten his readers as to the reason why the French have imposed the ban. This was, they would have a clearer understanding of the controversy and not be quick to criticise the French government.  On the other hand, the French Prime Minister wants to justify the decision to ban based on security reason. This would perhaps be something that the French public would accept as a matter of urgency.	<b>6-7</b>

- (d) Study Source E and F.  
Having read Source E, are you surprised by Source F. Explain your answer. [7]

Level	Descriptor	Mks
<b>L1</b>	<b>Answer based on provenance or no match</b> <b>Addresses one source but not the other</b> <b>Addresses both sources but without addressing the element of surprise</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>L2</b>	<b>Surprised / Not surprised based on provenance of F</b>  <i>2 marks for not surprised</i>  I am not surprised by Source F because it is something I would expect the spokesman of the UN Human Rights Commission to say.  <i>3 marks for surprised</i>  I am surprised that he would criticise another government openly.	<b>2-3</b>

L3	<p><b>Surprised based on contrasting idea</b></p> <p><i>4 marks for not surprised, explained</i>  <i>5 marks for more developed answers</i></p> <p>Having read Source E, I am not surprised by Source F. Both sources tell me that the burkini ban has jeopardised the security situation in France. In Source E, it says that 'the photographs (of police officers asking a Muslim woman to remove her burkini) shot in Nice this week might serve as a recruitment tool for the Islamic State.' This means that it could potentially provoke a terrorist attack in France. Similarly in Source F, it says that 'the burkini ban does not improve the security situation but rather fuel religious intolerance and the stigmatisation of Muslims in France.' Since both sources convey a similar idea, I am not surprised by Source F.</p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>4 marks for surprised, explained</i>  <i>5 marks for more developed answers</i></p> <p>Having read Source E, I am surprised by Source F. They seem to have differing reasons as to why the burkini ban should not be accepted. While Source F addresses the issue of basic human freedom, Source E looks at the issue from a purely security perspective. In Source F, the author mentions that the ban is an 'illegal breach of fundamental freedoms.' Source E criticizes the ban for playing into the hands of the terrorists as it served 'as a recruitment tool for the Islamic State', hence unwittingly promoting the cause of the terrorists by inciting anger or negative sentiments against the French government. Since they are looking at the issue from different perspectives, I am surprised.</p>	4-5
L4	<p><b>L3 + Evaluate reliability of SE based on provenance and purpose, explained</b></p> <p>I am not surprised that the author of the newspaper in Source E would be critical of the decision by the French government to ban the burkini. He wants to highlight the short-sightedness and folly of the decision. It had provided the jihadists with the perfect reason to justify their acts of terror. Since this is a Western/American newspaper, he probably wants to influence the readers into thinking that the French government's decision is a grave miscalculation that could jeopardise the security of the country. This could also serve as a warning for other governments to not follow suit. He also mentioned how Italy had made the correct decision not to ban the burkini.</p>	5
L5	<p><b>L3 + Evaluate reliability of SF based on provenance and purpose, explained</b></p> <p>Source F is by the spokesperson for the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. The organisation is responsible for championing the cause of human rights and to speak up against any</p>	6

	human rights abuses. It is therefore expected that it would criticise the burkini ban, as the ban is seen to violate the human rights of Muslim women in France. It therefore aims to put pressure on the French government to lift the ban. As such, it is not surprising for the spokesman to criticise the ban.	
--	--	--



(e) Study all sources.

How far do the sources show that the burkini threatens social stability in France?

Explain your answer.

[10]

Level	Descriptor	Mks
L 1	<b>Writes about statement, no valid source use</b>	<b>1</b>
L2	<p><b>Yes / No, supported by valid source use</b></p> <p>1 source 2-3m 2 sources 3-4m 3 sources 4m</p> <p>The cartoon in Source A shows how the woman is being asked to remove her burkini. This could incite an angry reaction from the Muslims in the country. They may feel that they have been unfairly treated and hence could develop animosity or antagonistic feelings towards the French authorities. This could possibly undermine social stability in France [3]</p> <p>Source B talks mainly about how the burkini was never intended to be an exclusively Muslim garment and how it has been misunderstood and politicised into a 'a product of hatred.' This suggests that the way it has been portrayed by the French authorities as a garment that divides the country could mean that it could threaten social stability in France.[3]</p> <p>Source C makes it clear that the burkini could threaten social stability in France because it symbolises the refusal of the Muslim community in France to assimilate into French society. The Prime Minister calls it 'a symbol of oppression'. This would not be well received by the Muslim community in France and drive a wedge between the government and the Islamic community because of the negative attitude both sides would have towards each other. Hence this could threaten social stability in France [3]</p> <p>Source D shows that the decision of the French government to ban the burkini may arouse anger and provoke extremism among some terrorist organisations, including boosting recruitment for the terrorist organisations. This could potentially threaten not just the social stability but even the security situation in France. The ban could be used as justification for retaliation by the terrorist organisations. However it must be stressed that it is not the burkini itself that threatens social stability in France but the ban on the burkini that could provoke possible retaliatory attacks by the terrorist groups. [4]</p> <p>Source F supports the idea that the burkini ban threatens social stability because it fuels 'religious intolerance and the stigmatisation of Muslims in France. These clothing bans have only succeeded in increasing tensions and as a result may actually undermine the effort to fight and prevent violent extremism. Clearly the author criticises the ban as being responsible for not only threatening the social stability but also the security situation in France. However, it does not mention that the burkini itself has</p>	<b>2-4</b>

	created social instability but the controversy surrounding the ban that has created social tension. [4]																																					
L3	<p><b>Yes AND No, supported by valid source use</b> i.e. Both elements of L2</p> <p><b>Consideration on number of sources used and the quality of analysis in deciding marks in L2 &amp; L3.</b> <i>5 marks for one good explanation from each perspective. Additional marks for subsequent well explained sources up to a maximum of eight marks.</i></p> <table><tr><th>L3</th><th>Yes</th><th>No</th><th>Marks</th></tr><tr><td>2 sources</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>5m</td></tr><tr><td>3 sources</td><td>1 / 2</td><td>2 / 1</td><td>6m</td></tr><tr><td>4 sources</td><td>2</td><td>2</td><td>7m</td></tr><tr><td>5 sources</td><td>2 / 3</td><td>3 / 2</td><td>8m</td></tr><tr><td colspan="3"><b>Unbalanced sources</b></td><td><b>Marks</b></td></tr><tr><td>4 sources</td><td>1 / 3</td><td>3 / 1</td><td>6m</td></tr><tr><td>5 sources</td><td>1 / 4</td><td>4 / 1</td><td>6m</td></tr><tr><td>6 sources</td><td>1 / 5</td><td>5 / 1</td><td>6m</td></tr></table>	L3	Yes	No	Marks	2 sources	1	1	5m	3 sources	1 / 2	2 / 1	6m	4 sources	2	2	7m	5 sources	2 / 3	3 / 2	8m	<b>Unbalanced sources</b>			<b>Marks</b>	4 sources	1 / 3	3 / 1	6m	5 sources	1 / 4	4 / 1	6m	6 sources	1 / 5	5 / 1	6m	5-8
L3	Yes	No	Marks																																			
2 sources	1	1	5m																																			
3 sources	1 / 2	2 / 1	6m																																			
4 sources	2	2	7m																																			
5 sources	2 / 3	3 / 2	8m																																			
<b>Unbalanced sources</b>			<b>Marks</b>																																			
4 sources	1 / 3	3 / 1	6m																																			
5 sources	1 / 4	4 / 1	6m																																			
6 sources	1 / 5	5 / 1	6m																																			
L4	<p><b>To score additional 2 marks, candidates can take any of the following routes. For the conclusion to be considered, students must have reached the upper most band of L3 i.e. 8 marks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><b>Through analysing at least one source in relation to its reliability, utility or sufficiency</b></li></ul> <p>e.g.. Source C makes it clear that the burkini could threaten social stability in France because it symbolises the refusal of the Muslim community in France to assimilate into French society. However this speech was made by the French PM in order to justify the burkini ban. The ban had divided French society. There were those who opposed the ban, as well as others who supported the ban. By portraying the burkini as something opposed to fundamental French values and principles, he hopes to garner support from those who could be ambivalent towards the issue. As such, this source does not extend our understanding if the burkini undermines social stability in France. [+2]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><b>By sharing examples(s) from contextual knowledge</b></li></ul> <p>I disagree that the burkini threatens social stability in France. In itself it is just a form of dressing which as the designer herself has made clear, not exclusive to Muslims alone. The burkini is being worn by women of other faiths as well. This is unlike the ban on hijabs and other religious symbols in schools introduced in 2004. However it is unfortunate that it has been politicised by segments on both sides, both the government as well as extremist groups who are quick to seize on the opportunity to further their</p>	10																																				

own agenda. For the French government, the burkini represents a threat to French principle of secularism. The extremist groups have been known to use the ban as an excuse to portray the Muslims as victims, just like how they did in response to other bans on Muslim religious dressing [+2]

**By giving a balanced conclusion / resolution**

Whether or not the burkini threatens social stability in France is very much a matter of perspective. From the government's perspective, the burkini represents an affront to French secularism, something which they hold very dear. However, if one were to look at Source B, then perhaps the burkini has been misrepresented from its original intention. It was never meant to be an exclusively Islamic garment. As such, the sources show that there are two sides the argument. Perhaps with time, through concerted efforts at raising awareness to the public through the mass media and outreach programmes, such concerns can be addressed. Each viewpoint can be accepted as valid and reasonable depending on the perspective from which you are looking at it.

## SECTION B (Structured-Response Question)

### 2. Being Part of a Globalised World

a) Extract 1 shows the growing threat of terrorism in Singapore.

In your opinion, how can Singaporeans play a part in making Singapore safer from a terrorist attack? Explain your answer using **two** strategies. . [7]

Level	Description	Marks
L1	Response merely describes the topic.	1
L2	<p><b>Response identifies and/or describes impact(s).</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Award 2m for identifying ONE reason and 3m for identifying TWO impacts.</b></li> <li><b>Award 3m for describing ONE reason and 4m for describing TWO impacts.</b></li> </ul> <p>e.g. One way Singaporeans can play a part in making Singapore safer from a terrorist attack is to avert/prevent one from happening in the first place. Members of the public or family members could be vigilant and be able to spot signs of radicalisation in a family member or friend. When a person adopts extreme political, religious or social views, they could be radicalised over time and may even develop the intention to engage in terrorist activities. Members of the public should learn to look out for signs of self-radicalisation. For example, when someone expresses the belief that violence is justified, starts to idolize or show support with terrorists and their causes, family and friends should try their best to counsel these possibly self-radicalised persons. Family and friends should also not hesitate to alert the authorities if they are unable to rein in these persons.</p> <p>e.g Another way Singaporeans can make Singapore safer from a terrorist attack by remaining alert and knowing how to respond to and manage terrorist threats. For example, Singaporeans can download the SGSecure App into their mobile phones. The SGSecure is a national movement to enhance Singapore's community response to the threat of terror. It aims to sensitise, train, and mobilise our community to prevent and deal with a terror attack. Singaporeans can play their part by being vigilant so that they can look out for and report any security threat. These could be in the form of articles left unattended in public place, persons showing suspicious behaviours and suspicious vehicles.</p>	2 – 4

L3	<p><b>L2 + Explains the ways</b></p> <p>Award 5-6m for explaining one way Award 6-7m for explaining two ways</p> <p>e.g. One way Singaporeans can play a part in making Singapore safer from a terrorist attack is to avert/prevent one from happening in the first place. Members of the public or family members could be vigilant and be able to spot signs of radicalisation in a family member or friend. When a person adopts extreme political, religious or social views, they could be radicalised over time and may even develop the intention to engage in terrorist activities. Members of the public should learn to look out for signs of self-radicalisation. For example, when someone expresses the belief that violence is justified, starts to idolize or show support with terrorists and their causes, family and friends should try their best to counsel these possibly self-radicalised persons. Family and friends should also not hesitate to alert the authorities if they are unable to rein in these persons. <b><i>By reporting them to the authorities such persons could help them get proper guidance and counselling so that they can be steered away from the path of radicalization and be a potential threat to society. Given that self-radicalisation is an increasing threat, community members must be wary of any drastic changes in behavior or thinking of family members or friends. The authorities may not be able to monitor the behavior of everyone in the country all the time. This is where the community can come in to fill the void to ensure that the threat posed by terrorism is minimised.</i></b></p> <p>e.g Another way Singaporeans can make Singapore safer from a terrorist attack by remaining alert and knowing how to respond to and manage terrorist threats. For example, Singaporeans can download the SGSecure App into their mobile phones. The SGSecure is a national movement to enhance Singapore's community response to the threat of terror. It aims to sensitise, train, and mobilise our community to prevent and deal with a terror attack. Singaporeans can play their part by being vigilant so that they can look out for and report any security threat. These could be in the form of articles left unattended in public place, persons showing suspicious behaviours and suspicious vehicles. <b><i>The community's role is crucial as the Government's effort alone is not enough. Government agencies cannot be at every place at all times. To safeguard Singapore against terrorist threats, everyone has to play a part.</i></b></p>	5-7
----	---	-----

- a) Extracts 2 and 3 describe ways in which homogenisation and hybridisation can affect food culture.

Do you think hybridisation has a greater impact on food in Singapore than homogenisation? Explain your answer.

[8]

Level	Description	Marks
L1	<b>Response merely describes the topic but without addressing the question.</b>	<b>1 – 2</b>
L2	<p><b>Describes the ways in which homogenisation and hybridisation affects food culture.</b></p> <p>Award 3 marks for describing the role of one factor. Award 4 marks for describing the role of both factors.</p> <p>e.g. Homogenisation has a great impact on food as the spread of foreign culture through the spread of fast food has become increasingly dominant in Singapore. With globalisation, it allows for the influence of food choices from another country to be spread more rapidly. The presence of foreign food cultures show that locals have embraced some aspects of these foreign influences. One such example would be McDonald's which can be found all over Singapore. This spread of fast food outlets has been criticised as promoting the homogenisation of food landscapes in the Asia, reducing cultural diversity. Asians, especially the younger generation, have taken a taste for chicken done Southern American style as compared to the local preferential styles of cooking, and even side lining the street favourites like Hainanese Chicken rice.</p> <p>e.g. Hybridisation has a great impact on food in Singapore as globalisation has led to the influence of foreign culture in food in Singapore, creating a new blend of culture which contains elements from both sides. Globalisation provides more opportunities for many foreign food brands like Burger King or Krispy Kreme to expand. Despite the claim that fast food restaurants homogenise food landscapes, there is evidence to show that local culture can maintain their influences when hybridisation takes place. One example will be the Burger King's Beef Rendang burger which incorporates influences of the Malay culture into their signature grilled beef patty and sauce. Another example will be the Ondeh-ondoh donut by Krispy Kreme, which is a beloved local sweet snack in Singapore.</p>	<b>3 – 4</b>
L3	<p><b>Explains the ways in which homogenisation and hybridisation affects food culture.</b></p> <p>Award 5-6 marks for explaining the role of one factor. Award 6-7 marks for explaining the role of both factors.</p> <p>e.g. Homogenisation has a great impact on food as the spread of foreign culture through the spread of fast food has become</p>	<b>5 – 6</b>

	<p>increasingly dominant in Singapore. With globalisation, it allows for the influence of food choices from another country to be spread more rapidly. The presence of foreign food cultures show that locals have embraced some aspects of these foreign influences. One such example will be KFC found all over Singapore. This spread of fast food outlets has been criticised as promoting the homogenisation of food landscapes in the Asia, reducing cultural diversity. Asians, especially the younger generation, have taken a taste for chicken done Southern American style as compared to the local preferential styles of cooking, and even side lining the street favourites like Hainanese Chicken rice.</p> <p><b>As many people consume food from these foreign food establishments, the consumption of local and traditional food may also reduce, which may eventually lead to its decline. This clearly shows that homogenisation has a great impact on food in Singapore because foreign food choices have changed the mindsets and habits of Singaporeans as they increasingly incorporate foreign culture as part of their daily routine.</b></p> <p>e.g. Hybridisation has a great impact on food in Singapore as globalisation has led to the influence of foreign culture in food in Singapore, creating a new blend of culture which contains elements from both sides. Globalisation provides more opportunities for many foreign food brands like Burger King or Krispy Kreme to expand. Despite the claim that fast food restaurants homogenise food landscapes, there is evidence to show that local culture can maintain their influences when hybridisation takes place. One example will be the Burger King's Beef Rendang burger which incorporates influences of the Malay culture into their signature grilled beef patty and sauce. Another example will be the Ondeh ondeh donut by Krispy Kreme.</p> <p><b>This is a result of the strong influence of local food culture where local preferences shape the hybridisation and clearly shows hybridisation causes an impact in Singapore as Singaporeans favour the eclectic and innovative flavours that result from it which invariably create interest and presents a wider variety of food choices for local consumers.</b></p>	
L4	<p><b>Both aspects in L3 + explains (evaluate) the relative importance of the each group.</b></p> <p><b><i>Example</i></b></p> <p>Homogenisation has a greater impact than hybridisation. The impact of homogenization is more broadbased and more prevalent. It affects a bigger group across many socio-ethnic group. For example, the impact of McDonalds is felt across several ethnic groups. Homogenisation can lead to a loss of local and traditional food while hybridisation could ensure that some characteristics/flavors/aspects of local and traditional food will still be retained. Furthermore, the impact of hybridization is limited is not as prevalent.</p>	8





